



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/726,692	12/04/2003	Louis V. Kirchhoff	21311A	5808

7590 11/14/2006  
Stevens, Davis, Miller & Mosher, LLP  
Suite 850  
1615 L Street, NW  
Washington, DC 20036-5622

EXAMINER

NAVARRO, ALBERT MARK

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

1645

DATE MAILED: 11/14/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

**Office Action Summary**

Application No.

10/726,692

Applicant(s)

KIRCHHOFF ET AL.

Examiner

Mark Navarro

Art Unit

1645

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 17 October 2006.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 6-11 and 18-27 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 6-11 and 18-27 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119**

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- \* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

**Attachment(s)**

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)                                | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)                       | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application                       |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____  |

## **DETAILED ACTION**

### ***Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114***

A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on September 25, 2006 has been entered.

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112***

1. The rejection of claims 6-11 and 18-20 under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as containing subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention, a written description rejection is maintained. Additionally, this rejection is applied to newly added claims 21-27.

Applicants are asserting that the claims have been amended to recite only a single species of the group.

Applicants arguments have been fully considered but are not found to be fully persuasive.

Applicants arguments are not commensurate in scope with Applicants claim language. As set forth in Applicants specification, polypeptides need not correspond

exactly over their entire lengths to be considered within the scope of the invention.

(Paragraph 36). It is precisely all of these “variants” which do not correspond to SEQ ID NO: 42 which are not adequately described.

Claims 6-11 and 18-27 recite a recombinant polypeptide comprising a sequence “corresponding to SEQ ID NO: 42.”

The specification and claims do not indicate what distinguishing attributes are shared by the members of the genus. Thus, the scope of the claims includes numerous structural variants, and the genus is highly variant because a significant number of structural differences between genus members is permitted. Since the disclosure fails to describe the common attributes or characteristics that identify members of the genus, and because the genus is highly variant, “corresponding to SEQ ID NO: 42” alone is insufficient to describe the genus. One of skill in the art would reasonably conclude that the disclosure fails to provide a representative number of species to describe the genus. Thus, applicant was not in possession of the claimed genus.

Specifically, SEQ ID NO: 42 is a fragment of a full length polypeptide, since the traditional start codon, methionine is missing. Absent the full length disclosure of the polypeptide, Applicants written description is satisfied only for the precisely identified fragment, i.e., consisting of SEQ ID NO 42, since additional amino acids N' or C' will have a profound impact on the activity of the protein.

Adequate written description requires more than a mere statement that it is part of the invention and a reference to a potential method of isolating it. The protein itself is

Art Unit: 1645

required. See *Fiers v. Revel*, 25 USPQ 2d 1601 at 1606 (CAFC 1993) and *Amgen Inc. V. Chugai Pharmaceutical Co. Ltd.*, 18 USPQ2d 1016.

*Vas-Cath Inc. V. Mahurkar*, 19 USPQ2d 111, clearly states that "applicant must convey with reasonable clarity to those skilled in the art that, as of the filing date sought, he or she was in possession of the invention. The invention is, for purposes of the 'written description' inquiry, whatever is now claimed." The specification does not "clearly allow persons of ordinary skill in the art to recognize that [he or she] invented what is claimed."

Applicants are directed to the Revised Interim Guidelines for the Examination of Patent Applications Under the 35 U.S.C. 112, 1 "Written Description" Requirement, Federal Register, Vol. 64, No. 244, pages 71427-71440, Tuesday December 21, 1999.

For reasons of record, as well as the reasons set forth above this rejection is maintained.

2. The rejection of claims 6-11 and 18-20 under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being vague and indefinite in the recitation of a polypeptide comprising a sequence corresponding to... SEQ ID NO: 39 is withdrawn in view of Applicants amendment.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102***

3. The rejection of claims 6-11 and 18-20 under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Kirchhoff et al is withdrawn in view of Applicants amendment.

The following new grounds of rejection are applied to the claims:

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112***

4. Claims 6-11, and 18-27 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

The claims are vague and indefinite in the recitation of "corresponding to SEQ ID NO: 42, 50, 36, etc."

As set forth in paragraph 36 of the specification, polypeptides need not correspond exactly over their entire lengths to be considered within the scope of the invention. However, Applicants specification does not set forth the amount of divergence which is permitted to still be considered corresponding to. Likewise, at what point is the divergence sufficiently distinct to no longer be encompassed by the term "corresponding to?" Without a clear definition of the term "corresponding to" one of skill in the art would be unable to determine the metes and bounds of the claimed invention.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102***

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

Art Unit: 1645

5. Claims 6-11 and 18-27 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Lafaille et al.

The claims are directed to a recombinant polypeptide comprising a sequence corresponding to SEQ ID NO: 42.


Lafaille et al (Molecular and Biochemical Parasitology Vol. 35, pp 127-136, 1989) disclose of the recombinant expression of multiple Trypanosoma cruzi genes, one of which has a high homology to SEQ ID NO: 42 of the instant invention. The recombinant polypeptide disclosed by Lafaille et al contains the sequence LAREKKLADRAFLDQKPE, see page 130, Figure 2. This sequence is 100% identical to amino acids 241-259 of SEQ ID NO: 42 of the instant invention.

Accordingly, given Applicants definition of "corresponding to" to include sequence variations, (paragraph 36 of specification), the disclosure of Lafaille et al is deemed to anticipate the instantly claimed invention.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Mark Navarro whose telephone number is (571) 272-0861.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Lynette Smith can be reached on (571) 272-0864. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.



Mark Navarro  
Primary Examiner  
November 9, 2006